

REMARKS

At the time of the Office Action dated June 27, 2005, claims 1-13 were pending in this application. Of those claims, claims 1-3, 6-10, and 13 have been rejected. Applicant acknowledges, with appreciation, the Examiner's indication that claims 4-5 and 11-12 contain allowable subject matter.

Claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 11, and 13 have been amended, and claims 5, 7, and 12 have been cancelled. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of allowable claim 5 therein, and claim 8 has been amended by incorporating the limitations of allowable claim 12 therein. Allowable claims 4 and 11 have been amended to be placed in independent form. Independent claims 6 and 13 have each been amended to recite limitations similar to allowable claims 5 and 12. Applicant submits that the present Amendment does not generate any new matter issue.

**CLAIMS 1-3, 6-10 AND 13 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AS BEING
ANTICIPATED BY PACKAGING WEBLOGIC SERVER J2EE APPLICATIONS (HEREINAFTER BEA)**

On pages 2-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserted that Bea discloses the invention according to that claimed. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, Applicant notes that claims 1 and 8 have been amended to respectively include the limitations recited in allowable claims 5 and 12. Thus, claims 1-3 and 8-10 are allowable

over the applied prior art. Since claim 7 has been cancelled, the only pending issue revolves about independent claims 6 and 13.

Independent claims 6 and 13 have been amended to recite the additional steps of identifying at least one configuration processing wrapper, which provides additional instructions for incorporating Web application configuration data in a Web application configuration descriptor; and, performing an incorporating step according to the additional instructions in the wrapper. This limitation is comparable to the limitations recited in allowable claims 5 and 12, now cancelled; and thus, Applicant submits that claims 6 and 13 are also allowable over the applied prior art for the same reasons. Applicant, therefore, respectfully solicits withdrawal of the imposed rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 8-10, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 for anticipation based upon Bea.

Applicant has made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. However, Applicant invites the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. Accordingly, and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant hereby respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

Application No. 10/079,018
Filed: 2/19/2002
Attorney Docket No.: RSW920010192US1 (7161-19U)

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 09-0461, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: September 27, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Scott D. Paul
Registration No. 42,984
Christopher & Weisberg, P.A.
200 E. Las Olas Blvd., Suite 2040
Fort Lauderdale, FL 33301
Tel: (954) 828-1488
Facsimile: (954) 828-9122